

Summary: November 20, 2007 meeting of the Accreditation Steering Committee

PRESENT: Liz Atkinson, Jennifer Ballard (staff), Greg Copeland, Pam Jacklin, Chris Keaveney, Brenda Marshall, Bill Millar, Dan Preston, Barbara Seidman, Jeff Summers, Bernie Turner, Pam Wheeler, Susan Whyte.

NEXT MEETING

Monday, December 17, 9:00 AM

Review drafts to date of standards 2 and 5.

MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

Minutes were reviewed and corrections made. Further details are needed to clarify the review of standard 6.

NEW DEADLINE

Committee set new deadline for getting the full draft to the Linfield community for review: **March 3**. Pam Jacklin offered to secure copy editing services for the draft that will be reviewed by the community.

STANDARD 3 REVIEW

Are there areas where we aren't in compliance? Only area of concern so far is 3.D.19 lack of explicit relationship between student media & college. It appears that Linfield's practices are sound, but the relationship hasn't been formally codified. The 1998 report indentified this as an issue, but there is currently no record of it having been addressed. In the standard, consider indicating that the process was not finalized but that it has been addressed this year.

Are there liability issues (radio, for example) for Linfield in the lack of an explicit written relationship?

Is standard 3 a good spot to look at the summer enrollment trends? Perception is that more McMinnville Campus students are enrolling in summer courses – leading to particularly good revenue situation this past summer. Recent presence of online courses may affect it. Does it enable students to do double majors, minors, etc? Senior Survey does not indicate a problem with completing on time, so it doesn't appear to be a matter of getting courses unavailable during the year.

Why are some sub-standards still blank? Working groups still 'in progress'. Many areas where DCE has not been included. Work groups need to be reminded to cover all of Linfield.

Strategic issues:

Summary: November 20, 2007 meeting of the Accreditation Steering Committee

Focus on the co-curricular experiential learning in this standard. Use the lessons/criteria from curricular experiential learning to inform co-curricular experiential learning assessment.

New issue to add to strategic list (or make explicit) – diversity of student body.

Integrate with foundational principles.

3.D.6 Reason for emphasis on merit in McMinnville financial aid awarding is not clear. Standard is broader. Re-focus on use of aid to shape the class.

Address the integrity of the aid process, particularly with regard to athletes. Make explicit that there is no relationship between athlete status and aid given (in fact, athletes get slightly less aid).

3.A.1/3.A.15 include programs in arts, music.

3.A.2 Clarify annual review process – is it policy or practice? The policy of annual review is clear. Don't state that it is practices unless we can show that it is.

Refine statement on services to athletes – all services are offered to all students, but are some services modified for athletes? (for example, a separate study session).

In general, need more references to exhibits and proof. For example, use of turnitin. Statistics on use are available from instructional support.

Any other details? Get to Dan Preston directly.

STANDARD 7 REVIEW

Make explicit a new strategic issue: the need/challenge to develop endowment. Needs exceed resources even though resources are well-managed. $\frac{3}{4}$ of foundational principles focus on resource development.

This standard is very descriptive so far – need more analysis of both what is working well and what the challenges are. Make problems more explicit. Provide more evidence.

Make more explicit how strategic plan drives budget.

Should comparative data be used? For example, comparison of endowment of similar or aspirational schools. Linfield doesn't have enough money to do all that it wants

Summary: November 20, 2007 meeting of the Accreditation Steering Committee

(doesn't have much as others), but has worked well with existing resources. The point was made that though some comparison is probably OK, but it is not considered – by accreditors – to be useful at describing how Linfield is achieving Linfield's mission.

Make integrity explicit. This standard has several opportunities (EthicsPoint, various procedures) to demonstrate institutional integrity. Link to standard 9.

Get other details to Greg Copeland directly.

STANDARD 8 REVIEW

Are there areas where Linfield is not in compliance? Biggest area of concern is lack of a current, approved master plan. Will the new master plan be done in time to be approved by Trustees? Currently, it is a work in progress.

The Trustees need to be involved in the master plan sooner rather than later – can they approve a draft with a draft list of priorities that can be finalized by staff? Also, consider showing the master plan draft to the Planning Council.

In strategic issue 4, delete reference to 45 students. There is concern about misinterpretation.

Clarify modernization needs vs. deferred maintenance. Can we show improvement in deferred maintenance in the last 10 years?

Highlight that 45% of classrooms have SMART technology – compared to 0 not that long ago (specify time frame).

In the facilities section, make explicit that physical facilities are less and less relevant to DCE as most of its program is online at this point.

Highlight the integrity, collaborative nature, and role of the Board of Trustees in the planning process.

Get other details to Jeff Summers directly.